UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2614th MEETING: 4 OCTOBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2614) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:

Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17510) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2614th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 4 October 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Vernon A. WALTERS (United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2614)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:

   Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17510)

The meeting was called to order at 11.45 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:

Letter dated 1 October 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17510)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2612th meeting, I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Cameroon, Cuba, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kuwait, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Malmierca Peoli (Cuba), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Garba (Nigeria), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Mangwende (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Botswana, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Taleb Ibrahimi (Algeria), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Wolde (Ethiopia), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Chamorro Mora (Nicaragua), Mr. Al-Shaali (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Majengo (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 3 October 1985 from the representative of Burkina Faso [*S/17525*] which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request that during the Security Council's discussion of the item entitled 'Complaint by Angola against South Africa', the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Peter Mueshihange, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation to Mr. Mueshihange under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure.

It was so decided.

4. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them document S/17522, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by South Africa.

5. The first speaker is the representative of Kuwait. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

6. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Vice-Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait spoke a few days ago and congratulated you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I should like to endorse

his words. I should also like to extend to you and to the other members of the Council my thanks for allowing me to participate in this debate as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for this month.

7. The judgement of history and of all those who closely follow the Council's work will be that this week the Council held continuous meetings to debate two events that were different in form but similar in substance—two events marked by the fact that they demonstrate belief in the supremacy of force over the concepts of law and justice. The aggressor in each case is a racist State which has constantly violated international law and international instruments and showed contempt for the will of the international community, of which the Council is the living conscience.

8. Since the beginning of the week, the Council has been dealing with blind Israeli aggression against the sovereignty and independence of the fraternal country of Tunisia. Since yesterday, it has been dealing with another act of blind aggression—South Africa's aggression against the sovereignty, security and independence of a friendly African country, Angola.

9. Those two aggressive States, Israel and South Africa, continue to demonstrate their firm commitment to the philosophy of force, hegemony and the use of terror in international relations. It is strange that both racist régimes have celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations in that unlawful manner, which reveals that their attachment to the Charter and to the objectives of the United Nations is in form only, having nothing to do with reality or practice. Therefore, in keeping with its legal responsibilities, the Council has been called upon to deal with the actions of those two racist régimes in such a way as to ensure that they comply fully with international law and respect the Charter.

10. The Council is meeting for the second time in two weeks to consider Angola's complaint about South Africa's repeated acts of aggression against its territory. These recent acts of aggression show South Africa's disregard for the international will, represented by resolution 571 (1985), which the Council adopted recently, and which has not yet been implemented owing to lack of time. These acts of aggression reveal South Africa's intransigence and arrogance. Its arrogance was again illustrated yesterday by South Africa's attempt to suggest what the ideal régime for Angola, an independent country, should be. Is not that flagrant interference in the internal affairs of an independent country, a sovereign, active Member of the United Nations?

11. South Africa has a long record in this area. It is both adversary and judge at the same time, in regard to not only the Angolan people but also the people of Namibia and the black majority within South Africa.

12. The Group of Arab States supports the fraternal country of Angola in its resistance to external aggression and in defence of its independence and sovereignty. The Council has on many occasions expressed its positive attitude in that connection, but the most recent act of aggression requires that it do more; it must discharge its responsibility under the Charter and adopt and enforce the specific measures that have long been demanded of it by the international community.

13. We support the proposals of various delegations, and in particular that of the President of the Group of African States, Mr. Garba, that mandatory, comprehensive sanctions be imposed on the racist régime. We hope that the Council will not fail to shoulder its responsibility and we shall not once again have to deal with a similar complaint in the Council. We want the Council to assume its responsibility under the Charter and to deter and call to order the aggressor.

14. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zimbabwe, Mr. Mangwende, whom I welcome. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

15. Mr. MANGWENDE (Zimbabwe): I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of this important body of our Organization for the month of October, and thank you and all the members of the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in this crucial debate.

16. At the same time, I congratulate the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom, Sir Geoffrey Howe, on the brilliant manner in which he chaired the special ministerial meeting of the Council on 26 September. Equally notable was the chairmanship of the knowledgeable representative of the United Kingdom, Sir John Thomson, during the same month.

17. On 20 September, the Council held an urgent meeting to consider the question of racist South Africa's renewed unprovoked aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. The sense of outrage and indignation felt by the members of the Council and by the international community as a whole regarding these barbarous acts of the Pretoria régime was clearly manifested in the letter and spirit of the resolution that emanated from that meeting—namely, resolution 571 (1985), which was unanimously adopted. That resolution, as will be recalled, *inter alia* demanded that the South African régime immediately withdraw its forces of invasion from Angolan territory and pay reparations for the loss of life and damage to property suffered by the people of Angola.

18. Barely two weeks have passed since that decision was taken, and yet today, once again, the peace-loving people of Angola are confronted with aggression by racist South Africa of even greater proportions. In total defiance of the decisions of the Council and in utter disregard for the norms and rules that govern the conduct of relations between sovereign countries—norms and rules which demand respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity

of other States—the racist expansionists have once again launched an unprovoked ground and air attack deep into Angolan territory, resulting in an unprecedented loss of life and property.

19. The Government and people of Zimbabwe spare no words in condemning in the strongest possible terms these latest manifestations of Pretoria's predilection to violence, destruction and murder of innocent civilians in defence of its repressive and immoral system of *apartheid*. We deplore the continued use of the international Territory of Namibia as a springboard for launching acts of aggression and destabilization against the People's Republic of Angola and other neighbouring States. We join the members of the international community in demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the racist troops from Angolan territory and prompt and full compensation by Pretoria for all the damage inflicted on the people of Angola during this unprovoked and unwarranted act of savage aggression.

20. To our brothers and sisters in the People's Republic of Angola, who are once again being subjected to the outrage and savagery of Pretoria's brutality, we offer our deepest sympathies and feelings of solidarity, for their suffering is our suffering and their death is indeed our death.

21. The Security Council has been seized of the question of South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola since 1976. During the intervening period the Council has made a series of solemn declarations and statements demanding that racist South Africa cease its provocative armed invasions of Angolan territory. In its resolution 428 (1978), in particular, the Council solemnly warned that, in the event of further acts of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola, the Council would meet again "in order to consider the adoption of more effective measures, in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof".

22. Seven years have passed since the adoption of resolution 428 (1978), and yet racist South Africa's troops are still occupying southern Angola. The Pretoria régime not only has intensified its campaign of terror and genocide in Angola, but has drawn the whole of southern Africa into a vortex of violence that now has very serious consequences for the stability of the region and international peace and security as a whole.

23. One is tempted to ask, what more must the Pretoria régime do before the members of the Council recognize the threat that it represents in our region? How much longer are the members of the Council going to be indifferent about a régime that has violated all norms of international behaviour, including all that the United Nations stands for? How much longer is the Council going to be satisfied with mere pronouncements and platitudes, when scores of innocent lives are lost each day as a result of Pretoria's wanton aggression and internal repression?

24. On trial here is the capacity of this respected international body to act to maintain world peace and security in the face of a defiant racist State that has flouted every decision of the United Nations. At risk is the sovereign right of the People's Republic of Angola and of all those States that are neighbours of South Africa to enjoy the fruits of their freedom and independence without external interference and intervention. At issue here is whether the people of Angola and those States in southern Africa which by no choice of their own are South Africa's neighbours—and we must emphasize that we did not choose to be neighbours of the racist régime—shall be protected by international law or continue to be at the mercy of the cyclones of South Africa's terrorism and expansionism. Is it not time that the Security Council rise above cynicism and despair and accept its responsibility to lead the fight against the crime of *apartheid*, which the Council and the General Assembly have long since described as a crime against humanity?

25. Surely the time for prevarication and hesitation has long since passed. We must now impose comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions as the only effective non-violent alternative left to the international community. The possible suffering of people of South Africa and the people of southern Africa as a whole should not be used as an excuse for not imposing sanctions. The majority are already suffering as it is. The alternative to the pain of sanctions is the certainty of a massive bloodbath in which people will not merely suffer pain but will actually be killed. Economic self-interest should not blind us to our responsibility to the suffering people of South Africa.

26. We have constantly pointed out that the *apartheid* policies pursued by the minority régime in Pretoria have been and remain the root cause of all the instability in southern Africa. That régime's belligerent and expansionist disposition has led it to seek hegemony in our region. It has sought to create a cordon sanitaire along its northern borders, in the hope of warding off pressures to change its immoral *apartheid* policies in South Africa itself. Faced with increasing isolation by the international community and confronted with a rising tide of dissatisfaction from within, the racist Pretoria régime has intensified its ruthless campaign to impose a "*pax Afrikaansa*" on the front-line States and other States in the region in order to create a state of dependency, thus making the region safe for *apartheid*.

27. The history of the *apartheid* régime in South Africa is one of duplicity, insincerity and broken promises. Recent events in southern Africa have fully demonstrated South Africa's bad faith and insincerity in its conduct of relations with its peace-loving neighbours. In the past, the Pretoria régime has sworn on its sacred *apartheid* that it has never, ever backed, financed and trained the MNR (*National Resistance Movement*) bandits who are perpetrating acts of sabotage and destabilization in Mozambique. And yet only two weeks ago, the duplicity of the racists was exposed and their Minister for Foreign Affairs was forced to admit that South Africa was and still is in blatant violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Mozambique.

28. In May this year the Pretoria régime ceremoniously announced that it was pulling its occupying forces out of Angolan territory, and yet only two weeks later South African commandos were caught red-handed in Cabinda Province in northern Angola. The régime has made promises regarding Namibia, but to date Pretoria remains the sole stumbling block to the achievement of genuine independence in that Territory. In the face of mounting pressure for change in South Africa itself, duplicity, lies and prevarication have become the master plan of the régime's survival game; on one hand it is seeking to make the world believe that *apartheid* is being reformed, but on the other it is further entrenching that evil system.

29. The Government of Zimbabwe is outraged at the fact that, despite these many acts of deception and arrogance, the Pretoria régime is allowed to continue to defy world opinion with impunity. We ask ourselves why in the last quarter of the twentieth century this Hitlerite régime is still tolerated, when so many lives were sacrificed during the last War to remove evil fascism from the face of the earth. Why are the great nations of this generation so anaemic in their reaction to this evil crime against humanity? Why is the reaction of those countries that often pride themselves on being great champions of liberty, justice and morality so feeble in the face of daily murders of unarmed children and women?

30. We are worried that there may be a connection between the intransigence and arrogance of the Pretoria racists and the policies and action—or inaction—of some of the great Powers. Our concern is based in part on the observed fact that there are countries which have dutifully and dependably abused their veto power to shield South Africa from any meaningful measures ever contemplated by the Security Council. But more recently we were astounded to read in *The New York Times* of 3 October about a statement purportedly made by the Secretary of State of the United States—that great nation. In that statement the Secretary of State is reported to have said, *inter alia*, that "we must also remember . . . what is today happening in . . . Angola, where people are fighting and dying for independence and freedom." In Angola, the statement continued, as in Nicaragua, Cambodia and Afghanistan, "there should not be any doubt of whose side we are on".

31. We ask the United States whose side it is on in Angola. Is it on the side of the UNITA (*National Union for the Total Independence of Angola*) bandits and their Pretoria allies? It says it does not want us to have any doubt of whose side it is on. We say that we are now in some doubt as to where it really stands on this issue. This is terribly important question to those of us who live in southern Africa, and, I dare say, to the rest of the peace-loving world as well.

32. On 2 June of this year, a Mr. Lewis Lehrman, of Citizens for America, organized a jamboree of international cut-throats and murderers at Jamba, the main UNITA base in Angola. We were informed that President Reagan had sent a letter of encouragement to that motley gang of bandits. Are we to assume, therefore, that the United States is on the side of UNITA and its accomplices? Then, on 17 September this year, we learned that the same band of desperados which had met earlier in Angola met again in Dallas, Texas, to co-ordinate their destabilization activities. From southern Africa, UNITA of Angola and the MNR bandits of Mozambique were among the honoured guests. To this collection of cut-throats and rapists, President Reagan sent a letter which read in part: "I commend you all for your part in this noble cause. Our combined efforts are moving the tide of history toward world freedom."

33. Can we really call that "constructive engagement", either of the active or of the passive variety? Are we wrong to see it as active constructive instigation? There is much doubt in our minds about all this.

34. Not long after that, the United States Congress repealed the Clark Amendment, which had forbidden the United States Government to give aid to UNITA. Then a few weeks later South Africa sent its forces into southern Angola to defend the UNITA bandits; at the same time, senior South African officials were dispatched to Washington to confer on the co-ordination of assistance to UNITA. Was it in fact an accident that during that time the United States abstained in a separate vote on paragraph 5 of resolution 571 (1985), which called for military help to be given to the front-line States and to the Government of Angola, to enable them to resist aggression?

35. The United States has many friends in southern Africa, but they are all disturbed by the apparent discrepancies and inconsistencies in the policies and actions of the United States towards Angola and southern Africa in general. We therefore wish the Secretary of State to spell out more clearly which side the United States supports in southern Africa, and particularly in Angola. Does it support the side of the perpetrators of this crime against humanity, the side of immorality, racism and the bands of reactionary murderers and malcontents, or does it support those who are standing up against that evil system? At this eleventh hour, it is important that this ambiguity be removed, and removed once and for all.

36. Le me end my statement by advising the Pretoria racists that no amount of internal repression or destabilization or aggression against Angola, Mozambique and other States in the region can ever save their evil system from its inevitable destruction. *Apartheid* is doomed. Cosmetic changes cannot save it. It must be dismantled. No amount of tinkering will help. It must be scrapped and removed from the face of earth. The time to do this was yesterday. Today there is little time left. Tomorrow there will be no time. The judgement of history has already been delivered, and the executioners are now in place.

37. Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): It is indeed with a feeling of sorrow and utter frustration that we meet again to consider Angola's complaint about yet another blatant act of aggression by South Africa against that country. Our

thoughts and sympathy go first of all to the Government and people of Angola.

38. So far South Africa has tried to justify its attacks on Angola as legitimate attempts to counter cross-border activities by SWAPO in Namibia. This was the case, for instance, during the Council's last debate on an Angolan complaint against South Africa, on 20 September this year.

39. Following the raid by South Africa's air force a few days later in the vicinity of Mavinga, even the South African President, however, found it impossible to sustain this fictitious allegation, and he openly admitted that the sole purpose of that attack was to support UNITA. This was also made abundantly clear by South Africa's Representative yesterday [*2612th meeting*]. His statement demonstrated more clearly than ever South Africa's double standards and hypocrisy. While maintaining at home one of the most oppressive and least democratic systems in the world, South Africa reserves for itself the right in the very name of democracy to be the policeman of the whole of southern Africa, to act as the supreme judge as to what is right and what is wrong in that region, to intervene militarily in neighbouring countries and to advise them on the conduct of their internal affairs. The culmination of hypocrisy is that South Africa asks the Security Council to act on a draft resolution which in all its aspects is a total negation of the norms of behaviour the South African Government has chosen for itself.

40. At least, then, the Council is this time facing a clear-cut issue. South Africa—in defiance of the decisions of the Council, in contravention of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and without even the thinnest veil of justification—continues its flagrant violation of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State. This is the basis on which the Council now has to make its decision and determine its action.

41. My country's position on South Africa's continued aggression against Angola is well known and is reflected in our support for the Council's previous decisions. We strongly condemn South Africa's behaviour and support Angola's proper and legitimate demand for full and adequate compensation for the loss of life and damage to property. We also urge Member States to take prompt, appropriate and effective action to bring pressure to bear on the Government of South Africa to comply with the Council's decisions.

42. The problem before us must be approached in its regional context, not in an East-West context.

43. In his recent letter to the Secretary-General the President of Angola has pointed to his country's right as a sovereign State to ask for broader assistance in the face of South Africa's continued aggression, and also emphasized its possible disastrous consequences for international peace and security.

44. Against this background, South Africa must be brought to understand that it is not in its own best interest that steps be taken which will further fuel the explosive developments in southern Africa. Such an outcome is certainly not in the interest of the world community, and the Council must strongly warn South Africa that it will not continue to tolerate action by South Africa which endangers not only regional stability but also international peace and security as a whole.

45. Mr. LI Luye (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): Before the ink has dried on resolution 571 (1985), condemning South Africa for its aggression against Angola, and before the fact-finding commission consisting of three Council members has embarked on its journey, the South African authorities have seen fit once again to commit a blatant armed invasion of Angola, resulting in serious loss of life and property on the part of the Angolan people.

46. This shows once again that the South African authorities do not have the least respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of South Africa's neighbours and that it is also bent on throwing down another challenge to the Security Council and to the entire international community.

47. In the face of this, the Chinese delegation is deeply outraged.

48. Just as the aggressor troops of South Africa are moving deep into the territory of Angola, the representative of South Africa is talking glibly about direct dialogue with Angola for the peaceful settlement of the dispute. This is nothing but deception.

49. It should be recalled that more than a year ago the South African authorities proposed negotiations with Angola and undertook to withdraw their troops completely from Angola within one month. However, subsequent developments have fully shown that they never meant what they said. The South African troops not only failed to withdraw completely, but, within a span of less than six months had launched three armed aggressions against Angola.

50. Since 1976 the Security Council has adopted nine resolutions at different times calling on the South African authorities to put an end to their intervention and aggression against Angola. However, the South African authorities have to date refused to implement them.

51. The Chinese delegation strongly condemns the South African authorities for their wilful aggression against Angola. In our view, in order to ensure respect for the resolutions of the United Nations the Security Council should take further concrete action in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter, strengthen its support and assistance to the Government and people of Angola and adopt effective sanctions against South Africa.

52. Lastly, I wish to take this opportunity to reaffirm that the Government of China will, as always, resolutely support the Government and people of Angola in their just struggle against the South African aggression and to safeguard their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

53. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on my list is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, Mr. Ahmed Taleb Ibrahimi. I welcome him and I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

54. Mr. TALEB IBRAHIMI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): The calm proceedings of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations have been disturbed and the soundness of its foundations put to the test by the will and the actions of the two régimes whose aggressive nature is insatiable.

55. We came here to commemorate noble ideals, but we have been caught up in events that bring to mind everything that the United Nations was designed to oppose. We came to commend the results of the arduous progress of the international community towards acceptance of the primacy of law, but we have been shaken out of that by the response of unbridled force.

56. Tel Aviv and Pretoria, in simultaneous moves corroborating the identity of their goals and the reality of their alliance, have tightened the African continent in their warlike grip and given free reign to outbursts of violence, examples of which overburden the records of the Security Council, which has too often been relegated to the position of a helpless bystander.

57. Over the years, the Council has grown accustomed to considering, in turn and with a frequency that their proliferating misdeeds have imposed on it, the cases of Tel Aviv and Pretoria. Today, zionism and *apartheid* have simultaneously stepped up their defiance as if the better to dissociate themselves together from the meaning and the promise of the comity of nations in commemorating the age of reason of the Organization.

58. Thus, at a time when zionism has expanded its sphere of aggression to North Africa, *apartheid* is once again the object of condemnation by the international community because of its recent attack on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola.

59. In this uninterrupted succession of reprehensible acts that make up the persistent aggression of the Pretoria régime against the People's Republic of Angola, the facts that have justified this new meeting of the Council are for many reasons particularly grave.

60. Those facts are indeed grave, first, because in the terms of the Charter of the United Nations, they constitute acts of aggression against a sovereign State, part of whose territory is still being occupied by Pretoria. Grave, because they are based on a so-called right of hot pursuit left over from colonial times, which the Pretoria régime presumes to exercise in its reaction against the national liberation struggle of the Namibian people. Grave also because they disregard the repeated condemnations and the frequent injunctions of the Security Council with regard to the Pretoria régime, the most recent of which were issued barely two weeks ago.

61. Clearly the military escalation against the front-line countries is very closely connected with the upsurge of the national resistance of the South African people to the oppressive *apartheid* régime. Through these acts of desperation at the regional level, Pretoria is trying in vain to divert attention from the daily martyrdom of those struggling against *apartheid* and its illegal presence in Namibia.

62. Thus, a policy that was set up with the sole intention of stifling the legitimate desire to break the chains of domination and oppression is being extended to the People's Republic of Angola. Ever since that country espoused the cause of freedom in that region, its territory, like the territory of other States in southern Africa, has suffered from South African aggression.

63. Because southern Africa as a whole is paying the price of its commitment to freedom, it is the duty of the international community to lend its support in keeping with the dictates of a moral and political imperative.

64. The non-aligned countries, for their part, are certainly shouldering their responsibilities in this regard. The reason they held their most recent ministerial meeting in southern Africa was to show once again their profound concern at the crisis situation that continues to affect that region and the dangers that it poses for international peace and security. By meeting at Luanda, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries sought to reaffirm its active solidarity with Angola. In deciding to meet next year at the highest level in Zimbabwe, the non-aligned countries expressed a commitment to take a more active part in the struggle to eradicate *apartheid*, in the complete decolonialization of Namibia and in ensuring that the countries of the region enjoy stability and security.

65. The use of violence institutionalized as a norm of conduct, the suppression of the right of peoples of self-determination and the constant aggression against independent States clearly reflect the total denial of the cardinal principles that led to the establishment of this organization. Consequently, these acts call for punishment.

66. Unless it wishes to accept the risk of the systematic use of force, which would inevitably be fatal to its authority, the Security Council, which has the means to fulfil its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, must not fail to take all the necessary steps to punish the aggressor and to restore the confidence in it. Its prestige and, above all, its credibility, are at stake, especially at the time of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, which, for the peoples victims of the philosophy that might is right, represents fresh hope

that their rights will be recognized and their just aspirations heeded.

67. If there is a golden opportunity to give meaning to the United Nations commitment to work for a better world, it lies here in the issue that is the subject of the present deliberations in the Council.

68. "United Nations for a better world"—those are lyrical words which might seem to indicate an attempt to reach an unattainable goal. Yet for the peoples of southern Africa it is a very real hope, the fulfilment of which would begin with the end of *apartheid*, the accession of Namibia to independence and the continuance of their economic and social development in peace and security.

69. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Angola has given the Security Council the incontrovertible facts relating to the continuing aggression by the racist régime of South Africa against his country. It was because of those facts that the question of that aggression was again brought to the Council. Blood is being shed on Angolan soil and people are perishing. Units of South Africa's regular armed forces have invaded Angolan territory and are continuing their hostilities there. The racists' air force is attacking the positions of that country's troops.

70. Scarcely two weeks have elapsed since the Council strongly condemned the racist Pretoria régime for its premeditated, persistent and sustained armed invasions of the People's Republic of Angola and described them as a serious threat to international peace and security, demanding the immediate cessation of such acts of aggression. The Council adopted similar decisions two months ago, in June of this year, in connection with the invasion by South African commandos of the Angolan province of Cabinda and the raid against Gaborone, the capital of Botswana. However, the South African régime turned a deaf ear to the Council's demands; far from ceasing such acts, it increased the scale of its aggression against Angola.

71. By its most recent invasion of Angola, South Africa is trying to forestall the inevitable rout of the armed UNITA gangs. There can be no doubt that those gangs are organized, maintained, armed and dispatched by Pretoria. Indeed, the racists now talk quite openly about this. On 20 September of this year, the South African Minister of Defence said that his country's ties with UNITA and its leader, Savimbi, are no secret and that they are material, humanitarian and moral. With regard to Savimbi, the Minister of Defence stated: "He supports the same norms and values in which we believe." After such revealing words of praise, the political figure of Savimbi, who has betrayed the interests of the African peoples and gone over to the colonialists, hardly merits any further comment. The UNITA gangs are being actively used by South Africa to destabilize the domestic situation in Angola and to subvert that country's sovereignty and independence.

72. However, the Pretoria racists are clearly not the only supporters of that mercenary organization. After the repeal of the so-called Clark Amendment, Washington clearly believes that the way is open for direct support to be given the subversive activities of the counter-revolutionary gangs. The recent statements of the United States Secretary of State, and in particular his words in New York on 1 October, cannot fail to be disquieting. It would seem that certain persons in Washington are preparing to apply in Angola the experience of providing direct military support to the Angolan contras that they have gained in Central America and other parts of the world.

73. A fact, however, is a fact: the results of the policy of "constructive engagement" with the Pretoria racists, a policy that even its authors are now calling "active constructive engagement," are aggressive attacks by South Africa and State terrorism carried out by Pretoria against Angola, Mozambique, Botswana and other African countries. The facts also show that the South African régime has now entered upon a new cycle of armed aggression against its neighbours. It has moved from posing a standing threat of aggression against them to a state of permanent war. And, of course, there is good reason for this, because racism and aggression are indivisible. Attacks on Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, the colonial war against the people of Namibia, subversion against Mozambique—these are all links in the same chain. They are all manifestations of that régime's continuing policy of viewing State boundaries, the sovereignty of its neighbours and the norms of international law as concepts not applicable to itself.

74. It is not through happenstance that Pretoria's military adventurism has resurfaced at the very moment when the Republic of South Africa is experiencing a deep-seated domestic political crisis. Given the growing mass popular movement against the *apartheid* system in South Africa itself, and given the mounting liberation struggle being waged by the people of Namibia, the Pretoria leaders are seeking a way out through external aggression. Inventing false pretexts for their acts of aggression against Angola, the Pretoria racists first alleged that they were pursuing units of SWAPO, although no such units had ever been heard of in that region of Angola in which the South African racists were engaging in hostilities. Similarly, Pretoria has made and continues to make statements about a "direct involvement" of the Soviet Union and Cuba in the actions of the Angolan armed forces against the UNITA gangs. That ploy is not new. The aggressors have adopted as a rule of conduct this recourse to the bugbear of a communist menace as an ideological screen behind which they can attack other countries. During the Second World War, Hitler also frequently held up the communist threat and a crusade against communism before invading a particular European country.

75. The *apartheid* régime resumed its military and subversive actions against African countries immediately after the Western Powers—once they had prevented the Security Council from adopting comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter—had stated that they were introducing their own "limited" sanctions. Is this not proof of the total emptiness of such so-called limited economic sanctions?

76. The African countries and the overwhelming majority of States in the world are quite rightly wondering how

much longer the Security Council will be prevented from adopting effective enforcement measures against the South African aggressor. Those who oppose the adoption of sanctions against the aggressor allege that such sanctions will not be effective and that they will even be harmful to the people of South Africa and neighbouring African countries. But such arguments are resorted to only when those who make them wish to defend South Africa—or Israel. In other instances, when sanctions have been unilaterally imposed in violation of the Charter—for example against Cuba, Nicaragua and certain other countries—they seem to believe that sanctions are indeed an effective means of exerting pressure, and they certainly do not seem to care whether they are harming the peoples of those countries. Such a double-standard approach benefits only aggressive régimes.

77. Today, when the Security Council is dealing with the parallel considerations of the Angolan complaint and that of Tunisia, we hear many bitter words, both here around the Council table and outside the Chamber, to the effect that this main United Nations body entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security is helpless when dealing with such repeated acts of aggression. We hear about the disappointment of Member States with the Council and indignation at its failure to act. At the same time, discussions are being held amongst the members of the Council about the need to enhance the Council's effectiveness. Some sitting at this very table take this to mean the adoption of certain modest procedural measures which, they allege, could in and of themselves restore confidence in the Council. That is surely no more than an attempt to divert attention from realities. The Council can become a truly effective body not through any cosmetic changes in its work, but only when some of its members renounce the policy of appeasement of the aggressor and show a willingness to proceed to the adoption of the effective enforcement measures set forth in the Charter.

78. Thus, whatever the plans of the South African racists and their supporters, Angola and the other front-line States and the national liberation movements of southern Africa will not be vanguished. They have many friends throughout the world. The strength of their resistance to aggression and their courage in defending their gains command universal respect.

79. The People's Republic of Angola, which is at the forefront of the struggle against colonialism, imperialism and racism, is entitled, like other independent African countries, to count on support from the United Nations and the Security Council.

80. The Soviet Union firmly supports the Angolan people and the other African peoples that are struggling for their freedom and independence. A statement by the Soviet Government dated 21 September of this year about South Africa's act of aggression against Angola emphasized that "The Soviet Government strongly condemns South Africa's criminal aggression and demands the immediate and complete cessation of hostile acts against the People's Republic of Angola. In view of the special danger South Africa's aggressive policy presents to the cause of peace, the Soviet Government calls on the Security Council to take against the aggressor the effective measures provided for in the Charter of the United Nations." [*see S/17491, annex.*]

81. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Once again, the People's Republic of Angola has been subjected to violence at the hands of South Africa, a tragedy that has recurred all too often in the history of the young Angolan nation, despite the provisions of the Charter and repeated resolutions by the Security Council.

82. The statement by the representative of Angola [*2612th meeting*] shows that we are not dealing with isolated facts but with the repetition of acts that reveal a blind determination to impose solutions of force by violating the sovereignty and integrity of other States and carrying out colonialist and racist practices. These are all flagrant violations of the values and principles that form the moral and legal basis of the Organization and that the Security Council thus has an inescapable obligation to protect.

83. The resolution to be adopted by the Council condemning this policy will be important, but it will be more so if the Council finally decides to assume a qualitatively different position and make effective and appropriate use of all the measures of recourse available to it under the Charter.

84. We believe that the time has come to go beyond the usual rhetoric and inhibitions. Peru is prepared to meet this moral and political responsibility.

85. Mr. de KÉMOULARIA (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation is shocked that once again a southern African State should be the victim of an invasion by South African armed forces. The position of my country on acts of this kind is clear and well known. France most vigourously condemns these unjustifiable armed attacks carried out in violation of international law.

86. Having reaffirmed that, I shall now confine myself to a few brief comments.

87. By using armed forces that it maintains in the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia, South Africa has once again violated the sovereignty and integrity of the People's Republic of Angola. My delegation wishes to express its solidarity with the people and Government of that country. Angola, like all other African countries, needs to have its security assured so that it can devote itself to the development of its economy and the improvement of the well-being of its people.

88. The latest South African attack gives proof of a disturbing acceleration in the cycle of violence in the region as a whole. I can thus only repeat that these armed confrontations will do nothing to settle the problems of southern Africa.

89. My country greatly regrets that escalation. It urges South Africa to withdraw its troops from Angolan territory without delay, to put an end to its aggressive policy towards its neighbours and to face squarely the real problems that it must resolve.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—March 1995—1,925